UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,504	06/13/2001	Thomas G. Hazel	MSFT 4936(160297.1)	5339

321   7590   03/24/2004

SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
16TH FLOOR
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER
ARSHAD, UMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	3

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/880,504	HAZEL, THOMAS G.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Umar Arshad	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _13 June 2001_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-50_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-50_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _2_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "users" in line 1 should be "user". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "display" in line 6 should be "displayed". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "wherein the second primary objects and the scope window is independent" on line 10 is grammatically incorrect. The examiner interprets this limitation to read "wherein the linking between the second primary objects and the scope window is independent". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 16 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 16, the phrase "and/or" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear which of the limitations listed are part of the claimed invention. The examiner interprets this phrase to be "or".

Claim 50 recites the limitation "first display window" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner interprets this limitation to read as "first primary display window".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 4, 8, 14 – 17, 21, 27, 30, and 44 – 46 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561.

As per claim 1, Malamud et al. ("Malamud") teaches a computer readable medium

having computer-executable instructions for performing a method comprising:

forming a scope window displaying one or more scope items therein (see

Malamud, figure 2, item 201; the examiner interprets window 201 as a scope window);

forming a first primary display window displaying one or more first primary objects

linked to the scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 203, column 4, lines 47 – 50,

and column 8, lines 62 – 67; the examiner interprets the contents of window 203 as first

primary objects); and

forming a second primary display window displaying one or more second primary

objects linked to the scope window wherein the second primary objects displayed by the

second primary display window are independent of the first primary objects displayed by

the first primary display window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4, lines

47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets

the contents of window 207 as second primary objects and it is inherent that the

individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each

have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer

readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for performing the step of forming a third primary display window displaying third primary objects linked to the scope window wherein the third primary objects are independent of the first primary objects and wherein the third primary objects are independent of the second primary objects (see Malamud, figure 2, item 208 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 208 as third primary objects and it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for:

forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window; and

forming a second secondary display window displaying second secondary objects linked to the first primary display window wherein the second secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group

is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project

group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also

inherent then that this sub project group window has a first primary window and a

second primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 1).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Malamud teaches the computer

readable medium of claim 3 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the

computer-readable medium of claim 3, having further computer-executable instructions

for forming a third secondary display window displaying third secondary objects linked

to the first primary display window wherein the third secondary objects are independent

of the first secondary objects and wherein the third secondary objects are independent

of the second secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught

that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a

project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project

group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also

inherent then that this sub project group window has a third primary window as taught

for a project group in the rejection for claim 2).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer

readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the

computer-readable medium of claim 1, wherein the scope window, the first primary

display window and the second primary display window form a workspace view which is

saved either as a local view on a local drive or as a global view in a database shared by multiple users (see Malamud, column 4, lines 30 – 34).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for defining window types, wherein the scope window, the first primary display window, and second primary display window are associated with one of the window types (see Malamud, figure 2, items 201, 203, and 207, column 4, lines 47 - 57, and column 8, lines 41 – 47; it is inherent that the windows have a window type because window 201 is a folder window that is different from windows 203 and 207, which are application windows).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Malamud teaches the method of claim 14 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the window types include one or more of the following: a table, a graph, a list, a list control, a topological view, and a text window (see Malamud, figure 2, items 203 and 207; the examiner interprets windows 203 and 207 to be text windows).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 14 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 14, having further computer-executable instructions

for allowing a user to convert the scope window, the first primary display window, or

second primary display window from one window type to another window type (see

Malamud, column 6, line 63 – column 7, line 2; the examiner interprets a folder window

as a window type and a project group folder window as another window type).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer

readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the

computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions

for performing the step of defining window types as a function of data driven from a

query, wherein the type of driven data determines the window type (see Malamud,

figure 5, items 502 and column 7, lines 10 – 20; the examiner interprets a folder window

as a display type and a project group folder window as another display type, and it is

inherent that a query to the status of the checkbox is made when displaying the window

to determine whether the window is to be a project group folder window type or a

regular folder window).

As per claim 21, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 27, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 30, it is of similar scope to claim 8 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 8 (see rejection above).

As per claim 44, it is of similar scope to claim 17 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 17 (see rejection above).

As per claim 45, it is of similar scope to claim 14 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 14 (see rejection above).

As per claim 46, it is of similar scope to claim 15 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 15 (see rejection above).

Claims 41 – 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Miklos, U.S. Patent No. 5,226,117.

As per claim 41, Miklos teaches a computer readable medium having

computer-executable instructions for performing a method comprising:

forming a scope window displaying scope items therein (see Miklos, figure 2, item

100 and column 4, lines 54 – 56; the examiner interprets the Directory window 100 as a

scope window);

forming a first primary display window displaying first primary objects linked to the

scope window (see Miklos, figure 2, item 40 and column 4, lines 54 – 56; the examiner

interprets the FRIENDS nickname list window 40 as a first primary display window and it

is inherent that the objects displayed therein are related to the Directory window 100);

forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked

to the first primary display window (see Miklos, figure 2, item 50 and column 4, lines 63

– 67; the examiner interprets the department 6BM nickname list window 50 as a first

secondary display window and it is inherent that the objects displayed therein are

related to the objects displayed in the FRIENDS nickname list window 40); and

linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that the first

secondary display window communicates with the scope window (see Miklos, column 4,

lines 63 – 67 and column 5, lines 21 – 31).

As per claim 42, which is dependent on claim 41, Miklos teaches the method of

claim 41 (see rejection above). Miklos further teaches the computer-readable medium

of claim 41, having further computer-executable instructions for:

assigning a particular object within the first secondary display window with a task

list (see Miklos, column 5, lines 38 – 39; the examiner interprets indicating the desire to

discard an object as setting a task list for an object);

sharing the assigned task list with other objects in the scope window (see Miklos,

column 5, lines 38 – 39; it is inherent that the task list is shared by two objects because

two objects are selected for discarding);

permitting the user to execute a new task on the particular object; and

executing the new task on the other objects (see Miklos, column 6, lines 2 – 8; it

is inherent that both selected objects are discarded upon user selection).

As per claim 43, it is of similar scope to claim 41 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 41 (see rejection above).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Miklos, U.S. Patent No. 5,226,117.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer

readable medium of claim 1. Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium

of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for:

forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked

to the first primary display window; and

linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that a command

or selection in the first secondary display window changes the focus or content of the

scope window.

Miklos et al. ("Miklos") teaches forming a first secondary display window

displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window (see Miklos,

column 4, lines 43 – 67); and linking the first secondary display window to the scope

window so that a command or selection in the first secondary display window changes

the focus or content of the scope window (see Miklos, column 5, lines 21 – 31). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

incorporate the method of Miklos with the computer readable medium of Malamud in

order to allow concurrent entry and manipulation of data within grandparent and

grandchild windows of the same application.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer

readable medium of claim 1. Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium

of claim 1, wherein the linking between the first primary objects and the scope window is

defined by an application developer or a user so that parameters are passed from the

scope window to the first primary display window and wherein the passed parameters

are used in a query to provide data to the first primary display window which determines

how it will be displayed. Miklos teaches wherein the linking between first primary

objects and a scope window is defined by an application developer or a user so that parameters are passed from the scope window to the first primary display window and wherein the passed parameters are used in a query to provide data to the first primary display window which determines how it will be displayed (see Miklos, column 2, lines 23 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Miklos with the computer readable medium of Malamud in order to allow concurrent entry and manipulation of data within parent and child windows of the same application.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Malamud and Miklos teach the computer readable medium of claim 6 (see rejection above). Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 6, wherein the query operates on a database to display a selected set of the first primary objects in the first primary window. Miklos discloses wherein the query operates on a database to display a selected set of the first primary objects in the first primary window (see Miklos, column 1, lines 15 – 17 and 25 – 26; the examiner interprets a list of items as a database). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Miklos with the computer readable medium of Malamud in order concurrent entry and manipulation of stored data shared by parent and child windows of the same application.

Claims 9 – 13, 18 – 20, 22 – 26, 28, and 31 – 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of

Ku et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,421,072.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer

readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud does not teach the

computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions

for allowing a user to select at least one displayed scope item in the scope window,

wherein the first primary objects are linked to the selected scope item and wherein the

second primary objects are linked to the selected scope item.

Ku et al. ("Ku") teaches computer-executable instructions for allowing a user to

select at least one displayed scope item in the scope window, wherein first primary

objects are linked to the selected scope item (see Ku, figure 3, items 310, 315 and 340,

and column 4, lines 27 – 36; the examiner interprets window 310 as a scope window

and nodes displayed therein as scope items, and window 315 as a first primary window

and nodes displayed therein as first primary objects and it is inherent that the nodes

displayed in window 315 are linked to parent node 340 in window 310) and wherein

second primary objects are linked to the selected scope item (see Ku, figure 3, item 350

and column 4, lines 27 – 36; it is inherent that node 350 can have a new window

created that contains a sub-tree with node 350 as the root node and a visual link to the

parent node of node 350, node 340, displayed in window 315). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the

computer-executable instructions of Ku with the computer readable medium of Malamud

in order to provide for an improved user interface that enables users to more easily and

effectively navigate through complex hierarchies of information stored in a computer

system.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Malamud and Ku teach the

computer readable medium of claim 9 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches

the computer-readable medium of claim 9, having further computer-executable

instructions for forming a third primary display window displaying third primary objects

linked to the selected scope item wherein the third primary objects are independent of

the first primary objects and wherein the third primary objects are independent of the

second primary objects (see Malamud, figure 2, item 208 and column 4, lines 47 – 50,

column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the

contents of window 208 as third primary objects and it is inherent that the individual

windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a

separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 9, Malamud and Ku teach the

computer readable medium of claim 9 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches

the computer-readable medium of claim 9, wherein the users selects at least one first

primary object in the first primary display window, and said computer-readable medium

having further computer-executable instructions for:

forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object; and

forming a second secondary display window displaying second secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object wherein the second secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a first primary window and a second primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 1).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Malamud and Ku teach the computer readable medium of claim 11 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 11, having further computer-executable instructions for forming a third secondary display window displaying third secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects and wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the second secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a third primary

window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 2).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 9, Malamud and Ku teach the method of claim 9 (see rejection above). Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 9 wherein the users selects at least one first primary object in the first display window, and said computer-readable medium having further computer-executable instructions for:

forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object; and

linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that the first secondary objects displayed in the first secondary display window are linked to the selected scope item in the scope window.

Ku teaches forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object (see Ku, figure 4, items 415, 420, 440 and 460, and column 4, lines 27 – 36; the examiner interprets window 415 as a first primary window and nodes displayed therein as first primary items, and window 420 as a first secondary window and nodes displayed therein as first secondary objects and it is inherent that the nodes displayed in window 420 are linked to parent node 460 in window 415); and linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that the first secondary objects displayed in the first secondary display window are linked to the selected scope item in the scope window (see Ku, figure 4, items 440, 462, 470 and 472; it is inherent that node 462 is linked to node 440 through links 472 and

470). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to incorporate the method of Ku with the computer readable medium of

Malamud in order to clearly signify hierarchical relationships in a tree structure

displayed across multiple windows.

As per claim 18, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 19, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 18, Malamud and Ku teach the

method of claim 18 (see rejection above). Malamud does not teach the

computer-readable medium of claim 18 wherein the users selects at least one first

primary object in the first display window and further comprising: a first secondary

display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display

window and linked to the scope window.

Ku teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 18 wherein the users selects

at least one first primary object in the first display window and further comprising: a first

secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary

display window and linked to the scope window (see Ku, figure 4, items 440, 462, 470

and 472; it is inherent that node 462 is linked to node 440 through links 472 and 470). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

incorporate the method of Ku with the method of Malamud in order to clearly signify

hierarchical relationships in a tree structure displayed across multiple windows.

As per claim 22, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 12, Malamud and Ku teach the

computer readable medium of claim 12 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches

the method of claim 21 further comprising the step of forming a third primary display

window displaying third primary objects linked to the scope window wherein the third

primary objects are independent of the first primary objects and wherein the third

primary objects are independent of the second primary objects (see Malamud, figure 2,

item 208 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 –

61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 208 as third primary objects and it is

inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other

because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and

closed individually).

As per claim 24, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 25, it is of similar scope to claim 12 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12 (see rejection above).

As per claim 26, it is of similar scope to claim 20 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20 (see rejection above).

As per claim 28, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 31, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 32, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 33, it is of similar scope to claim 12 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12 (see rejection above).

As per claim 34, it is of similar scope to claim 13 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13 (see rejection above).

As per claim 35, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same

rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 36, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 37, it is of similar scope to claim 20 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20 (see rejection above).

As per claim 38, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 18 (see rejection above).

As per claim 39, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 40, it is of similar scope to claim 20 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20 (see rejection above).

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Ku et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,421,072 as applied to claim 28 above further in view of Miklos, U.S. Patent No. 5,226,117.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, Malamud and Ku teach the method of claim 28 (see rejection above). Malamud and Ku do not teach the method of claim 28 wherein the linking between the first primary objects and the scope window is defined by an application developer or a user so that parameters are passed from the scope window to the first primary display window and wherein the passed parameters are used in a query to control the display of the first primary objects in the first primary display window.

Miklos teaches wherein the linking between first primary objects and a scope window is defined by an application developer or a user so that parameters are passed from the scope window to the first primary display window and wherein the passed parameters are used in a query to control the display of the first primary objects in the first primary display window (see Miklos, column 2, lines 23 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Miklos with the computer readable medium of Malamud and Ku in order to allow concurrent entry and manipulation of data within parent and child windows of the same application.

Claims 47 – 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Brooks, U.S. Patent No. 6,008,809.

As per claim 47, Malamud teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a data structure, comprising:

a scope window displaying scope items therein and allowing a user to select at least one displayed scope item (see Malamud, figure 2, item 201; the examiner interprets window 201 as a scope window);

a first primary display window displaying first primary objects linked to the scope window and having an edge adjacent an edge of the scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 203, column 4, lines 47 – 50, and column 8, lines 62 – 67; the examiner interprets the contents of window 203 as first primary objects); and

a second primary display window displaying second primary objects linked to the scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 207 as second primary objects).

Malamud does not teach a second primary display window having an edge adjacent to an edge of the scope window or an edge of the primary window wherein adjacent edges are docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge. Brooks teaches a window having an edge adjacent to an edge of the scope window or an edge of the primary window wherein adjacent edges are docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge (see Brooks, figures 12 – 14, items 502, 504 and 524 and column 10, lines 25 – 36 and 49 – 59). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the

method of Brooks with the method of Malamud in order to allow multiple windows to be

viewed on the same level, without the time consuming process of having to resize and

position multiple windows.

As per claim 48, which is dependent on claim 47, Malamud and Brooks teach the

computer readable medium of claim 47 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches

the computer-readable medium of claim 47 wherein the linking between the second

primary objects and the scope window is independent of the linking between the first

primary objects and the scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4,

lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; it is inherent that

the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they

each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed

individually).

As per claim 49, which is dependent on claim 48, Malamud and Brooks teach the

computer readable medium of claim 48 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches

the computer-readable medium of claim 48 further comprising:

a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the

first primary display window; and

a second secondary display window displaying second secondary objects linked

to the first primary display window wherein the linking between the second secondary

objects and the first primary display window is independent of the linking between the

first secondary objects and the first primary display window (see Malamud, column 11,

lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a

sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group

displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when

opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a first primary

window and a second primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for

claim 1).

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Brooks, U.S. Patent No. 6,008,809

as applied to claim 28 above further in view of Ku et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,421,072.

As per claim 50, which is dependent on claim 48, Malamud and Brooks teach the

computer readable medium of claim 48 (see rejection above). Malamud and Brooks do

not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 48 wherein the users selects at least

one first primary object in the first display window and wherein a first secondary display

window displays first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window and

linked to the scope window.

Ku teaches wherein the user selects at least one first primary object in the first

display window and wherein a first secondary display window displays first secondary

objects linked to the first primary display window and linked to the scope window (see

Ku, figure 4, items 440, 462, 470 and 472; it is inherent that node 462 is linked to node

440 through links 472 and 470). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Ku with the method of

Malamud and Brooks in order to clearly signify hierarchical relationships in a tree

structure displayed across multiple windows.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UA

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100